

Application Serial No: 10/751,188
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: October 1, 2007

REMARKS

Applicants respond to the Office Action mailed on April 5, 2007. Claims 2, 4-8, 11-13, 15 and 16 are pending.

Examiner Interview:

Applicants thank the Examiner, Mr. Aristotelis Psitos, for the telephonic interview that took place on November 1, 2007 with the Applicants' representative. In the interview, Applicants noted how the features of "only the first optical film intersects the first optical axis, only the second optical film intersects the third optical axis, and both the first optical film and the second optical film intersect the second optical axis" of claim 15 are found in Figure 22A. In particular, we noted that the "first optical film" of claim 15 is the wavelength separation film (40) of Figure 22A and the "first optical axis" of claim 15 is the optical axis of the semiconductor laser (1) of Figure 22A. We also noted that the "second optical film" of claim 15 is the wavelength separation film (41) of Figure 22A, the "third optical axis" of claim 15 is the optical axis of the semiconductor laser (3) of Figure 22A, and the "second optical axis" of claim 15 is the optical axis of the semiconductor laser (2) of Figure 22A. The Examiner agreed that this interpretation of claim 15 is supported by Figure 22A.

§112, First Paragraph:

Claims 2, 4-8, 11-13, 15 and 16 are rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the rejection asserts that the features of "only the first optical film intersects the first optical axis, only the second optical film intersects the third optical axis, and both the first optical film and the second optical film intersect the second optical axis" in claim 15 cannot be readily mapped with the specification as originally filed. This rejection is traversed.

As discussed above, during the Examiner interview of November 1, 2007, Applicants noted that these features of claim 15 are found in Figure 22A and the Examiner agreed that the above interpretation of claim 15 is supported by Figure 22A. Accordingly, claim 15 does comply with the written description requirement and withdrawal of this rejection to claims 2, 4-8, 11-13, 15 and 16 is requested.

Application Serial No: 10/751,188
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: October 1, 2007

Office Action of March 12, 2007:

Applicants note that the Amendment submitted on July 12, 2007 overcomes the prior art rejections set forth in the previous Office Action mailed on March 12, 2007 and claims 2, 4-8, 11-13, 15 and 16 presented in the July 12, 2007 Amendment comply with the written description requirement. Accordingly, withdrawal of the prior art rejections set forth in the previous Office Action mailed on March 12, 2007 is requested.

Conclusion:

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, 4-8, 11-13, 15 and 16 are in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicants' primary attorney-of record, Douglas P. Mueller (Reg. No. 30,300), at (612) 455-3804.

Respectfully submitted,



December 3
Dated: November , 2007

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By:

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/ahk